

## REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are currently active.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-10 as being anticipated by Casey.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In relevant part, on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner refers to the limitation of Claim 1 of "a set of one or more routing tasks, the set including at least one routing task for each different type of routing protocol employed in the set of VPRNs, each routing task being operable only with a separate routing table and with separate routing protocol state information to realize a corresponding virtual router to carry out associated routing operations in a VPRN", emphasis added. The Examiner cites column 4, lines 10-15 and column 4, lines 51-55 of Casey as support for this limitation.

Referring to column 4, lines 10-15, it simply states "using a VR to exchange routing information with one or more enterprise site routers is the most general mechanism for disseminating private network reachability information. Part of the stub link configuration is to specify what routing protocol runs over it, between the private network router and the VBR 10."

Column 4, lines 51-55 simply states "as a result of routing exchanges between peer VRs and between VRs and private network routers, as appropriate, each VR will build a forwarding table that relates private network address prefixes (forward equivalency classes) to the next hop."

As is plainly evident from a review of this language and the teachings of Casey, the aforementioned limitation is nowhere to be found, let alone the limitation of "each routing task being operable only with a separate routing table". Accordingly, Casey cannot anticipate Claim 1 of applicants. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is reading this limitation into the teachings of Casey, where this limitation is simply not there.

Claims 2-5 are dependent to parent Claim 1 and are patentable for the reasons Claim 1 is patentable.

Claim 6 is patentable for the reason Claim 1 is patentable. Claims 7-10 are dependent to parent Claim 6 and are patentable for the reasons Claim 6 is patentable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejections and objections to this application be reconsidered and withdrawn, and Claims 1-10, now in this application be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPHEN M. ALFIERI, ET AL.

By Ansel Schwartz

Ansel M. Schwartz, Esquire  
Reg. No. 30,587  
One Sterling Plaza  
201 N. Craig Street  
Suite 304  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213  
(412) 621-9222

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**  
I hereby certify that this  
correspondence is being deposited with  
the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail  
in an envelope addressd to:  
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box  
1450, Alexandria, VA 22318-1450 on  
11/13/85  
Ansel M. Schwartz  
Ansel M. Schwartz  
Registration No. 30,587